UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,057	02/09/2001	Jon Miles		7550

7590 02/08/2005	EXAMINER

Jame W. Hiney, Esq.
THE TECHNOLOGY LAW OFFICES OF VIRGINIA
P.O. Box 818
Middleburg, VA 20118

EXAMINER
STERRETT, JONATHAN G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/781,057	MILES, JON
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan G. Sterrett	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 February 2001</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office-action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/9/2001</u>.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Summary

1.   Claims 1-40 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-15, 17-24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 36, 37 and 40 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Micromain's MS2000 software

product as described in the following documents:

Web.archive.org, micromain.com, February 21, 1999, "An Open

Environment", pp. 1-2, hereafter referred to as Reference A.

Web.archive.org, micromain.com, December 2, 1998, "Questions and

Answers", pp. 1-7, hereafter referred to as Reference B.

Web.archive.org, micromain.com, April 17, 1999, "Products", pp. 1-2,

hereafter referred to as Reference C.

Web.archive.org, micromain.com, February 24, 1999, "msWeb Questions

and Answers", pp. 1-2, hereafter referred to as Reference D.

Web.archive.org, micromain.com, April 17, 1999, "Tips and Tricks –

MS2000", pp. 1-6, hereafter referred to as Reference E.

Web.archive.org, micromain.com, February 24, 1999, "msWEB", pp. 1-2,

hereafter referred to as Reference F.

Web.archive.org, micromain.com, April 24, 1999, "msEXEC", pp. 1-4,

hereafter referred to as Reference G.

Web.archive.org, micromain.com, April 17, 1999, "Tips and Tricks – MS2",

pp. 1-10, hereafter referred to as Reference H.

Web.archive.org, micromain.com, February 21, 1999, "MS2000 Glossary",

pp. 1-10, hereafter referred to as Reference I.

Web.archive.org, micromain.com, April 24, 1999, "MS2000", pp. 1-2,

hereafter referred to as Reference J.

Regarding Claim 1, MS2000 discloses:

a central database controlled by the system operator (Reference A page 1

paragraph 2 line 3-5, MS2000 developed using Microsoft™ Access 97),

means by which customers can access the database by logging on with a

proper ID (Reference B page 3 paragraph 1 line 2-3, password protection for any

area of program),

means permitting said customers to create work orders for said vendors

on said system (Reference B page 2 paragraph 3, system allows work orders to

be created; Reference C page 1 paragraph 3 line 3-5, msRequest allows any

user to create and send work requests) and

means allowing said vendors to access said work orders and schedule

work based thereon (Reference B page 2 paragraph 3 line 1, work orders can be

created for any task; Reference D page 1 paragraph 3 line 9, work order contains

date the work request is to be completed by) as well as notifying said customers

of any changes in said work orders such as estimated completion dates and or

equipment or material changes (Reference C page 2 paragraph 1 line 1-2,

msMOBILE allows users to update and close work orders; Reference B page 5

paragraph 4 line 6-7, work orders contain location and equipment information;

Reference B page 2 paragraph 3 line 1, work order contains information as to

when work order is due; Reference J page 1 paragraph 2 line 8, software has

pager interface to send information or notification).

Regarding Claim 2, MS2000 discloses:

means for allowing customers to create work orders to said vendors

further allows said customers to review all previously submitted work orders to

any given vendor (Reference F page 1 paragraph 3 line 1-2, user can review

status of any work previously scheduled) and to update customer information for

the benefit of the vendor (Reference A page 1 paragraph 7 line 1-2, Microsoft™

outlook can be used to access and update names and addresses)

Regarding Claim 3, MS2000 discloses:

A system which allows said customers to indicate the nature of the work

order, whether normal or emergency or some other category (Reference B page

2 paragraph 3 line 2, preventative and routine maintenance categories for work

orders) and to make changes to said work order over time (Reference C page 2

paragraph 1 line 1-2, users can update work orders from the field).

Regarding Claim 4, MS2000 discloses in which the vendor can run reports

on certain aspects of the work order (Reference B page 4 paragraph 4 line 1-2,

data can be exported in various database and other file formats; Reference B

page 6 paragraph 3 line 2-3, reports can be filtered by date, property, asset or

labor).

Regarding Claim 5, MS2000 discloses an on-line work order management

system wherein said report is a resource allocation by employee by date report

(Reference G page 3 paragraph 1 line 2,8, asset activity and labor details).

Regarding Claim 6, MS2000 discloses wherein said report is an employee

assigned by hours by date report (Reference G page 3 paragraph 1 line 2,8,

asset activity and labor details; Reference E page 2 paragraph 2 line 5-8,

employees time is assigned to difference cost centers for a particular week).

Regarding Claim 7, MS2000 discloses wherein said report is the number

of customer work orders by date report (Reference G page 3 paragraph 1 line 7

completed work order information).

Regarding Claim 8, MS2000 discloses wherein said report is a

work order dump report (Reference G page 3 paragraph 1 line 7, completed work

order information is available from database).

Regarding Claim 9, MS2000 discloses lowing vendors to access the

database to schedule work thereon allows them to create work orders

(Reference C page 2 paragraph 1 line 1-2, users can create, update and close

work orders; Reference C page 2 paragraph 1 line 5-7, technology allows

seamless transmission of work order details between device and database).

Regarding Claim 10, MS2000 discloses wherein said vendors are able to

access both open orders and closed orders (Reference C page 2 paragraph 1

line 1-2, users can create, update and close work orders; Reference C page 2

paragraph 1 line 5-7, technology allows seamless transmission of work order

details between device and database, including accessing both open and closed

orders; Reference A page 1 paragraph 9, Microsoft™ Access can be used to

provide access to database to develop customer tables, queries, forms and

reports).

Regarding Claim 11, MS2000 discloses wherein said vendors are allowed

to schedule equipment in conjunction with each work order (Reference B page 1

paragraph 3 line 2, equipment can be managed and tracked; Reference B page 2

paragraph 3 line 1, work order details what needs to be done, including specific

equipment maintenance, and when it needs to be done).

Regarding Claim 12, MS2000 discloses wherein said vendors are able to

schedule the priority of the customer work orders (Reference H page 8

paragraph 4 line 4, priority of a work order is established for each work order)

and to establish completion dates (Reference C page 2 paragraph 1 line 1-2,

users can close work orders, thus establishing completion dates).

Regarding Claim 13, MS2000 discloses wherein said vendors are

able to conduct a text search of all customer orders using a key word (Reference

A page 1 paragraph 9, Microsoft™ Access provides the ability to create forms

and queries to perform text searches of customer orders using a key word).

Regarding Claim 14, MS2000 discloses wherein said vendors are

able to allocate either or both in-house or contract labor to a work order

(Reference E page 2 paragraph 2 line 5-8, employee can be allocated to different

cost centers for the purpose of assigning part of his labor to a particular work

order).

Regarding Claim 15, MS2000 discloses wherein said vendors are

able to assign certain of its employees to access selected portions of the

customer records regarding work orders and customer profiles (Reference B

page 3 paragraph 1 line 1-3, any area of program can be password protected to

assign access to employees).

Regarding Claim 17, MS2000 discloses wherein said vendors are

able to review equipment available for each work order and schedule said

equipment for said work order (Reference B page 2 paragraph 3 line 2,

maintenance for equipment is scheduled when work order is created).

Regarding Claim 18, MS2000 discloses wherein said vendors

are able to schedule preventive maintenance on said equipment (Reference B

page 2 paragraph 3 line 5, work order can be created for any preventative

maintenance task).

Regarding Claim 19, MS2000 discloses wherein said vendors

are able to modify said preventive maintenance schedule on said equipment

(Reference H page 2 paragraph 2 line 1-5, normal maintenance tasks, including

preventative maintenance, can be rescheduled).

Regarding Claim 20, MS2000 discloses wherein said vendors are able to

both add equipment to said work orders and to modify the equipment assigned to

the work orders (Reference B page 2 paragraph 3 line 1, work orders specify

what it to be done – line 2, including routine or preventative maintenance on

equipment; Reference B page 2 paragraph 1 line 6, equipment parts lists can be managed and tracked by system; Reference B page 5 paragraph 4 line 6, for example, 'air handler 15' is a description of a piece of equipment that can be added to work orders).

Regarding Claim 21, MS2000 discloses:

a web-based database controlled by the system owner (Reference A page 1 paragraph 1 line 1-4, system runs based on Microsoft™ Access 97; Reference C page 1 paragraph 5 line 1-6, msWeb utility provides Intranet or Internet capability);

vendor access means by which vendors can create work orders for their customers (Reference B page 2 paragraph 3 line 1, vendors can create new work orders – line 4, vendors can create new work orders at a customer inspection point when the inspection is marked 'failed') who may order from more than one vendor on the system (Reference I page 3 paragraph 1 line 3-4, several different shops constitute vendors on system, in this example the electrical shop is a vendor with past due work orders);

customer access means by which customers can submit their own work orders (Reference C page 1 paragraph 3 line 1-5, any user on a networked computer can send in a work order);

whereby said system allows for both vendor and customer access and review by either as to the status of said work orders (Reference F page 1 paragraph 3 line 1-2, using msWEB a user can pull up and review the status of any previously requested work orders).

Regarding Claim 22, MS2000 wherein customer access means allows for said customers to update information about itself on said database (Reference A page 1 paragraph 7 line 1-2, database can access Microsoft™ Outlook to access and update names and addresses of staff).

Regarding Claim 23, MS2000 discloses wherein said customer access means allows customers to create their own work orders (Reference B page 2 paragraph 3 line 6, msREQUEST allows any networked computer to send a work request that when approved becomes a work order; Reference F page 1 paragraph 2, user creates work order to be sent for maintenance staff to process) and while doing so to review equipment of the vendor available for use with their work order (Reference B page 6 paragraph 2 line 1-3, any file, including drawings of equipment, can be attached to a work order for review by anyone who accesses the work order).

Regarding Claim 24, MS2000 discloses wherein said customer access means allows the customer to be notified of action taken by the vendor in regard to its work order (Reference F page 1 paragraph 3 line 1-5, REQUEST STATUS FUNCTION allows users to call up status of any work order).

Regarding Claim 26, MS2000 discloses wherein said customer access means allow the customer's employees to review all previous work orders with a a particular vendor on the system (Reference B page 1 paragraph 3 line 7, work orders are tracked by database in system; Reference A page 1 paragraph 3, Microsoft™ Access 97 allows creation of custom reports to view data of work orders; Reference I page 3 paragraph 1 line 2-4, criteria examples allows viewing

of all past due orders with a particular vendor, in this example, the electrical shop).

Regarding Claim 27, MS2000 discloses wherein said customer access means allows the customer to place work orders with any number of vendors on the system (Reference C page 1 paragraph 4 line 5-7, msService allows user to assign labor to a particular work order).

Regarding Claim 29, MS2000 discloses wherein said vendor access means allows vendors to set up customer accounts and modify them (Reference H line 2 paragraph 3 line 11-14, CTRL-N key allows setting up a new record from any screen, including a new customer; Reference C page 2 paragraph 1 line 1-2, work orders can be updated).

Regarding Claim 30, MS2000 discloses wherein said vendor access means allows said vendors to assign its employees selective access to selected portions of said system for working with those areas within their job description (Reference B page 3 paragraph 1 line 1-3, selective access can be set up for any area of system using password protection).

Regarding Claim 32, MS2000 discloses a system which allows the vendor to create customer work orders on behalf of the customer (Reference B page 2 paragraph 3 line 4, work orders can be created for customers when inspections are marked as 'failed' – line 5, or from any PM task) and to review said work orders over time (Reference H page 2 paragraph 3 line 6-10, records can be browsed over time of any work orders, including pending, assigned to a property or all completed work orders).

Regarding Claim 33, MS2000 discloses a system which allows the

vendor to run reports on one or more customer work orders (Reference G page 3

paragraph 1line 7, reports can be run on completed work order information;

Reference G page 3 paragraph 2 line 1-2, Access 97 allows custom reports to be

run on any work order information) or on resource allocations (Reference E page

2 paragraph 2 line 5-8, employee's time can be allocated to difference costs

centers to be stored in database), employees assigned to the work order by

hours and dates (Reference E page 2 paragraph 2 line 5-10, employee hours

can be assigned to different work orders by labor hours and dates by assigning

them as a different labor account to be allocated differently), or work orders by

date (Reference G page 3 paragraph 1 line 7, completed work order information

includes date when work order was opened and closed).

Regarding Claim 36, MS2000 discloses a system which allows the

vendors to create vendor employee accounts each with a separate ID or

password (Reference A page 1 paragraph 10 line 1-3, Microsoft™ Access

provides user-level security to provide password protection on any table, form,

query or report).

Regarding Claim 37, MS2000 discloses a system which allows the vendor

to modify information concerning itself on the database so as to change what is

viewable by its customers (Reference B page 3 paragraph 1 line 1-3, since

MS2000 uses Access 97, it provides password protection to restrict access to

various parts of the system, including changing what is viewable by customers;

Reference A page 1 paragraph 10, user level security provided for any table,

form, query or report).

Regarding Claim 40, MS2000 discloses a system which allows the

customer to update its customer profile on said system (Reference A page 1

paragraph 7 line 1-2, database can access Microsoft™ Outlook to access and

update names and addresses of staff).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 16, 31, 35, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over MS2000 in view of Acclaim Software's Cashbook

software product for small business as described in the following documents:

Web.archive.org, acclaimsoftware.com, February 9, 1999, "Invoicing", p.1,

hereafter referred to as Reference A.

Web.archive.org, acclaimsoftware.com, February 9, 1999, "Cashbook

Complete – Ver 2.12", pp.1-2. hereafter referred to as Reference B.

Web.archive.org, acclaimsoftware.com, February 18, 1999, "Standard

Reports", pp.1-2. hereafter referred to as Reference C.

Regarding Claims 16, 31, 35, 38 and 39, MS2000 teaches a database

system (Reference A page 1 paragraph 2 line 3-5) using data tables composed

of records (Reference I page 8 paragraph 2 line 1-4) that track maintenance

costs, manage projects and manage budgets (Reference C page 1 paragraph 1

line 6-7). MS2000 teaches that the records can be edited using an action query

in Microsoft™ Access (Reference I page 8 line 7). MS2000 teaches that vendors

can review work order details (Reference D page 1 paragraph 2 line 2, msWeb

allows users to review a detailed description of the work to be done). MS2000

teaches allocating maintenance costs to various cost centers (Reference C page

2 paragraph 2 line 5-6).

MS2000 does not teach wherein said vendors are provided with a record

of customer payments on work orders and can review payment details, as per

Claim 16, wherein said vendor access allows the vendors to display a record of

customer payments on any one or several work orders that customer has with

the vendor, as per Claim 31, a system which allows the vendor to review all

customer payments, to add comments, to review payment detail and work order

details, as per Claim 35, a system which allows the vendor to run an invoice

history from the system operator, as per Claim 38, and a system which allows the

vendor to access and review late payment information by its customers, as per

Claim 39.

Cashbook teaches wherein said vendors are provided with a record of

customer payments on work orders and can review payment details (Reference

A Figure 1, payment details sample view), as per Claim 16, wherein said vendor

access allows the vendors to display a record of customer payments on any one

or several work orders that customer has with the vendor (Reference A Figure 1,

this example shows a record of two customer payments – one for site cleaning and one for site preparation), as per Claim 31, a system which allows the vendor to review all customer payments (Reference A Figure 1, Drop Down box "TO" at top allows all customer payments from O'Meagher Computers to viewed), to add comments (Reference A Figure 1, Notes sections at bottom), to review payment detail and work order details (Reference A Figure 1, both work order and payment details are shown as breakdowns into two line items), as per Claim 35, a system which allows the vendor to run an invoice history from the system operator (Reference A line 8, invoicing graphs by month can be generated), as per Claim 38, and a system which allows the vendor to access and review late payment information by its customers (Reference A Figure 1, "Date" allows vendor to review late payment information), as per Claim 39.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art of business accounting that managing account receivables to ensure that the business is generating adequate revenue and adequate cash flow to support operations is an essential part in successfully running a business.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of MS2000, as discussed above, with the teachings of Cashbook, as discussed above for Claims 16, 31, 35, 38 and 39, because it would automate the management and review of accounts receivables, including payments and partial payments, to ensure the business is generating adequate revenue and cash flow to support operations as a successful element in running a business.

6.   Claims 25, 28 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over MS2000.

        Regarding Claim 25, MS2000 teaches prioritizing work orders (Reference

H page 8 paragraph 4 line 4) and categorizing work orders (Reference G page 3

paragraph 1 line 4, maintenance category information) according to preventative

or normal maintenance (Reference B page 2 paragraph 3 line 2). MS2000

teaches using a pager interface (Reference J page 1 paragraph 2 line 8).

MS2000 does not teach customer access indicating whether a work order is

normal or emergency. The examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well

known in the art to have a work order that can be indicated as normal or an

emergency. In many production plants, rental properties or shopping malls that

require scheduled or unscheduled maintenance and use work orders to queue,

schedule and track maintenance activities, there are occasions where immediate

'emergency' attention is required due to the nature of the incident requiring

maintenance or work. Examples of these would include failure or potential failure

of key pieces of equipment where immediate attention is required. Other routine

activities or tasks required would be categorized by customers as normal. The

distinction allows maintenance planning and management to effectively prioritize

resources according to which work order requires immediate attention. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify the teachings of MS2000, as discussed above, with a customer indicating

a work order as normal or emergency, because it would allow maintenance

planning and management to prioritize resources according to the nature of the

task or activity required and in so doing, maximize maintenance resource

utilization according to where it would have the most benefit.

Regarding Claim 28, MS2000 teaches using email (Reference J page 1

paragraph 2 line 11) and using Microsoft™ Outlook to track names and

addresses. MS2000 teaches that work order requesters can use msWeb to track

a work order to determine its status (Reference C page 1 paragraph 5 line 1-3).

MS2000 does not teach notifying customers of changes in status of their work

order or order on the system. The examiner takes Official Notice that using email

for notification of status updates is old and well known in the art. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify the teachings of MS2000, as discussed above, with providing customers

email notification of status changes in their work orders or work orders on the

system, because it would automate and provide immediate feedback to the

customer as to when the status changed on their work order or a work order in

the system.

Regarding Claim 34, MS2000 teaches it provides the framework to

manage and track equipment and tools (Reference B page 1 paragraph 3 line 2 –

page 2 paragraph 1 line 2). MS2000 teaches scheduling regular tasks

(Reference E page 2 paragraph 1, "Create Weekly task Lists") and scheduling

tasks associated with regular or preventative maintenance (Reference B page 2

paragraph 3 line 2).

MS2000 does not teach allowing the vendor to review the equipment used

on work orders, to schedule said equipment according to work order, and to

schedule the maintenance of said equipment on a regular basis. The examiner

takes official notice that it is old and well known in the art of maintenance for a

maintenance department or vendor to have a facility for maintenance, e.g.

maintenance department or workshop. This facility typically houses the

equipment and tools required by the maintenance personnel to accomplish

activities associated with maintenance, including those specified by a work order.

It is old and well known in the art for maintenance personnel to review the

equipment used on work orders or other tasks to ensure it is the correct

equipment and it is in proper working order. It is also old and well known in the

art for maintenance personnel to perform maintenance on their own equipment

on a regular basis. In a typical manufacturing facility it is usually the

maintenance department alone that can perform maintenance on their own

equipment. It is also old and well known in the art of maintenance to associate

equipment required to perform a work order with the scheduling of that work

order. For example, maintenance crews having their own assigned tools and

equipment would carry those tools and equipment with them as they performed

scheduled work orders. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of MS2000, as discussed

above, with reviewing the equipment used on work orders, to schedule said

equipment according to work order, and to schedule the maintenance of said

equipment on a regular basis, because it would ensure that maintenance

personnel have the proper equipment, it is in proper working order, and it is

available when needed in performing scheduled work orders, all to ensure the

efficient functioning of a maintenance department.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Callen US Patent 6,556,976 discloses a system and method for e-

commerce and related data management, analysis and reporting.

Stauber US Patent 6,574,635 discloses an object-oriented framework that

supports e-commerce.

Burns US Patent 5,189,606 discloses a system for cost estimating,

analysis and reporting.

Zweben US Patent 6,216,109 discloses a system iterative repair

optimization with application to scheduling and capacity planning.

Cornett US Patent 5,216,612 discloses a computer integrated

maintenance system and method.

Aycock US Patent 5,765,138 discloses a computer-assisted method for

managing suppliers and outsourcing.

Storch US Patent 5,920,846 discloses a system for handling service

requests.

Natarajan US Patent 5,099,431 discloses an automated rework shop

order scheduling system.

Faaland US Patent 5,524,077 discloses a scheduling method and system.

Ackroff US Patent 5,721,913 discloses an integrated activity management system.

Kardos US Patent 6,430,562 discloses system for integrated resource management.

Borg US Patent 5,835,898 discloses a visual schedule management system for a manufacturing facility.

Web.archive.org, micromain.com, April 17, 1999, "Tips & Tricks – msREQUEST for MS2000", pp. 1-2.

Web.archive.org, micromain.com, December 1, 1998, "MS2000 Installation Examples", pp. 1-3.

Griffiths, David, 1998 CMMS, PM/PdM Handbook, "The Next Logical Step", web.archive.org, plantservices.com, pp. 1-3.

Web.archive.org, datastream.net, December 12, 2000, "MP2 Product Line", pp. 1-2.

Web.archive.org, norand.com, February 6, 1998, "Norand Case Study", pp. 1-3.

Web.archive.org, norand.com, February 6, 1998, "Norand Field Service", pp. 1-2.

Web.archive.org, eaglecmms.com, March 3, 2000, "Proteus Product Info", pp. 1-5.

Web.archive.org, eaglecmms.com, December 17, 2000, "Proteus Computerized", pp. 1-7.

http://www.plantmaintenance.com/articles/CMMS_survey_2000.shtml, pp.
1-11.

Pappas, Lorna, April 1999, "Part II: Full-Service Maintenance
Outsourcing", Shopping Center World, v28, n4, p130.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from
the examiner should be directed to Jonathan G. Sterrett whose telephone
number is 703-305-0550. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the
examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 703-305-9643. The fax
phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is
assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from
the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information
for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public
PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through
Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-
direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-
free).

Susanna Diaz

SUSANNA M. DIAZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER

AU 3623

JGS

2-5-2005